

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan R. Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**PLAINTIFF WAYMO'S OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NON-  
INFRINGEMENT**

**Hearing:**

Date: June 8, 2017

Time: 8:00 a.m.

Place: 8, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor

Judge: The Honorable William H. Alsup

1 On May 2, Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Ottomotto LLC, and Otto Trucking LLC  
2 (collectively “Defendants”) moved for summary judgment of non-infringement with respect to a  
3 subset of the patents-in-suit (U.S. Patent Nos. 8,836,922, 9,285,464 and 9,086,273) and with  
4 respect to two specific devices: Spider and Fuji (the “Motion”). Dkt. 330-4 at 5-7. On May 12,  
5 Defendants withdrew their Motion as to Spider, which Defendants do not dispute uses a common  
6 lens to transmit and receive light. Dkt. 430 at 2. According to discovery to date, the remaining  
7 device at issue in the Motion, the Fuji, does not use a common lens to transmit and receive light.  
8 Accordingly, although Waymo has not yet served its infringement contentions in this case, *see*  
9 Dkt. 283 (proposing May 23 deadline for infringement contentions), on May 15 Waymo explained  
10 to Defendants that Waymo will not be asserting patent claims from the ’922, ’464 or ’273 patent  
11 against the Fuji. Jaffe Declaration Ex. A (“Ex. A”) at 2. In other words, Waymo will not be  
12 accusing Fuji on this record of infringing the single lens patents.

13 Waymo informed Defendants of this and asked them to withdraw what remains of the  
14 summary judgment motion so as to avoid using any further Court resources on the one lingering  
15 aspect of the Motion. Uber demurred, responding: “Waymo is welcome to file its response to  
16 Uber’s pending motion for summary judgment tomorrow, informing the court that Waymo no  
17 longer intends to pursue patent infringement claims against Fuji. Upon such filing, Uber is willing  
18 to withdraw its pending motion for summary judgment.” Ex. A at 1.

19 For the subset of patents identified in Uber’s partial summary judgment motion, Waymo  
20 will not be pursuing patent infringement claims of the ’922, ’464 and ’273 patents against Fuji  
21 based on current discovery. Waymo thus expects Defendants to timely withdraw their Motion.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 To the extent Defendants do not do so or do not do so in a timely fashion, Waymo respectfully  
2 requests that the Court deny Defendants' Motion as moot for the reasons described above.

3  
4 DATED: May 16, 2017

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
LLP

5 By /s/Charles K. Verhoeven

6 Charles K. Verhoeven  
7 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28